1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

Sometimes, however, the identity of a scandalmonger becomes known. John went to another village to catch a glimpse of the daughter of George Carvounis whom he was considering as a possible bride for his younger brother Demetrios. In the coffee-shop he casually mentioned the girl's name to Michael Goulas who, perhaps guessing the direction of the visitor's interest, told him that the girl was round-shouldered and absent-minded. At first John accepted this statement and without further delay returned to his home: but later he was persuaded by the marriage negotiator that he had been deceived, and after a further visit the marriage contract was eventually arranged. Goulas is relatively prosperous but already had a reputation for meanness and taciturnity. Even before this incident he was an infrequent visitor to the coffee-shop where he was careful to avoid any large gathering in whose company he might have to spend money. Meanness, envy, and unsociability form a pattern of qualities related in Sarakatsan thinking to evil and dishonour. The unsociable man is so because he has something to hide, he hides what he lacks, and what he lacks makes him envious of others. Meanness follows naturally upon envy. Had the poison of his scandal been effective, the crime of Goulas would probably never have become known. In the event, he was condemned and avoided by those who accepted John's version of the incident, and people did not hesitate to describe him as a man without honour (ἄτιμος).

It follows that an honourable man, when he covertly glimpses a prospective bride, is careful never to disclose, except to trusted kinsmen, the true purpose of his visit. For if he decides not to ask for the girl's hand, and this fact becomes public knowledge, people will wonder what flaw he sees in the girl's character and qualities. More generally, it is evil to spread any false scandal which may provoke insult, and response to insult, between other men, and may lead to killings and orphans.

The hut or house is inviolable. No stranger may invade it without an invitation. Similarly, whatever takes place within the sanctuary of its walls is private and sacred to the members of the family. This understanding makes possible the warmth, affection, and easy intercourse of family life secluded from the public gaze. It is a sin, and a source of the greatest shame, if a man is caught with his ear to the wall of his neighbour's house

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

or hut. It is, nevertheless, true that people are insatiably curious about the details of domestic life and relations in other families. The condemnation of eavesdropping, although ideally it points to the recognition of the right of family privacy, in practice merely places a negative sanction on one particularly blatant method of obtaining information about other people's affairs.

Men are not honourable who, possessing great physical strength, use it to tyrannize others. They are men who without cause or restraint attack others with insults, using their mothers' or sisters' names in offensive sexual contexts or uttering other provocative blasphemies. Such a man, it is believed, purposely stages an incident to humiliate another who must either lose honour by not responding, or suffer a physical beating. It is accepted that, in most instances, to insult another is neither avoidable nor dishonourable. A sheep strays across a boundary, another shepherd stones it, its owner insults him, blows are exchanged. This sequence of events is to be expected in a community where the interests of different families conflict and each man must maintain his self-regard and the honour of the family. But wanton and unprovoked outrage is evil.

There are, also, categories of persons whom it is always dishonourable for a man to assault: women, old men, young boys, and children, persons weaker than himself. A man who interferes with women, or picks a quarrel with an old man or a young boy, quickly loses his social reputation. It sometimes occurs that, when grazing land is disputed, a family will send its sheep under the guard of a young shepherd boy into the disputed area, knowing that the other shepherd will not improve his case with the community, the villagers, or the police, if he strikes the youth. However, this is a dangerous tactic since, if the young shepherd is struck, honour demands retaliation.

There is one other category of persons that a man must not exploit, the very poor. Whereas a Sarakatsanos will not hesitate to trick or deceive other men, it is not honourable to take advantage of a very poor man with only twenty or thirty animals, particularly if he has a young family. It is the very fact of his dependence on the generosity and forbearance of those of greater power and prestige that morally prevents them from exploiting him. In the face of the implicit admission of his failure in life they cannot press home their advantage. Since

596 /155 cont./
474 derived from a good relationship with it. Business will thus become
556 easier and more profitable.
591

596 These benefits and advantages would never be realized if one
474 sought to enrich oneself individually and improve one's mode of life.
434 By establishing large flocks--which is only possible for a group, for
233 reasons that we shall see--a person certainly increases his patrimony. However, by acting in this way he aims chiefly to assert himself socially, to create situations whereby the group will benefit by means of a certain disposition of the income.

596 Yet there is more. Each family has the right to a certain portion
474 of the milk products and the wool, in terms of its own needs and indepen-
434 dently of the share that goes toward the family wealth. Now this type of income "in kind" is also controlled by the group. In order to
[126] examine this fact more specifically we shall reproduce a little story which we recorded on the spot:

596 /156/ An old Sarakatsani woman threw to the dogs the food that
474 the men had not eaten. This woman died. One night, after her burial,
689 her daughter-in-law heard noises coming from the dog shelter. She ran
775 there and saw her mother-in-law eating with them. She immediately
434 alerted her husband, the son of the deceased. But he, knowing that his wife was not on good terms with her mother-in-law, believed that it was a question of malice and paid no attention. But the appearance of the dead woman continued and finally the son was convinced that his mother had really become a ghost. In their dilemma, the couple called
[189] a priest who conducted a service on the grave. Thereupon gifts were
[431] handed out "in the name of the mother," and the dead woman, finally at rest, never reappeared.

596 In order to understand the profound significance of this anecdote
474 we must interpret the gravity of the punishment and the mode of
689 redemption for the sin committed. If the old woman was punished so
434 severely it was because she misused food--common property acquired by

/156 cont./

596 404 684 434 [431] joint labor and inheritance. And if, in order to redeem the sin of the guilty one, her relatives were obliged to hand out gifts, that was in order to compensate those who had been injured by her behavior.

However, this explanation seems insufficient, the severity of the sanction exceeding the importance of the economic abuse. The solution of the problem is found in the fact that the setting-aside in common of a share of the common products represents a guarantee for all. The life of all, from the material point of view, must be assured, independently of the importance of the share of each one in the patrimony. The Sarakatsani insist absolutely that each one always have the means of subsistence. The old woman, by misusing food, violated this rule. She therefore ran counter not only to economic values, but also and chiefly to social values, touching the very basis of Sarakatsani life, founded largely on a community spirit which we shall soon describe.

596 404 684 431 182 It is this infraction which justifies the harshness of the punishment. Likewise, the meaning of the distribution of gifts is not limited to a restoration of losses. It involved another aspect, that of restoring the spirit of community, violated by the old woman, and takes into consideration that fact (of which the study of hospitality and of sacrifice /157/ will convince us) (32) that the gift, the donation rather, establishes solidarity.

32. See below, chapter on Religion.

596 404 434 Now the setting-aside of products represents a second form of the disposition of income for the benefit of all. The lesson that one may draw from it is the same as that which was implied in the preceding case. In summing up both we see that what we have called "group control of income" does not lead to a collectivization of the latter, strictly speaking, but to a utilization and in part to an alienation (in the legal sense) determined by economic, and above all social, objectives for the benefit of the group.

596 404 Having said that, we may conclude from the four principles

/215 cont./

181 671 182 groups of which we are speaking. If the latter are capable of solving actual overt cases, they are equally capable of preventing potential conflicts. We believe that here is a phenomenon of major importance and /one that is/ very characteristic of Sarakatsani society and culture.

As a matter of fact, the persons involved, faced with a concrete case, know in advance the behavior they must follow, and this for two reasons. The rules of custom are known to them. Whereas in our societies law is obliged to resort to the assumption that "no one is supposed to be ignorant of the law," in traditional societies the law is part of everyday experience. (32)

32. M. Mauss: Manuel, "the intimacy of law," p. 110.

In the second place, even in case a rule does not exist--and it might then be necessary to apply a spontaneous law for the purpose--the interested parties are in a position to foresee the decision of society. Moreover, these same individuals are perfectly conscious of the fact that if they should act contrary to these expectations, they would be facing the responses of their society which would ultimately prevail. They therefore adjust their behavior accordingly. Of course, all this goes on silently. The distress and drama that this state of affairs provokes never ruffles the surface of phenomena. The observer believes there is an automatic conformism which in fact is constantly developing and which basically maintains the life style of our herders.

* * * *

627 686 689 However, the question of whether individuals actually adjudicate by also applying at a sanction /216/ still remains open. By referring to the concrete cases of their activity that we have judged to be legal, and examining them in the light of our preceding developments, we can reply in the affirmative. The dismissal of participants by the Tséligas, at any time, the rift in the family when the head is deemed disloyal, the lack of cooperation with a dishonest Tséligas, constitute true punishments,

/216 cont./

627 686 689 decided upon and carried out by individuals. They are variants of the major sanction, namely social isolation, the nature and importance of which we have pointed out. With respect to the removal of the head, we have nothing to say since the facts speak for themselves.

After this general survey we may conclude:

627 692 182 626 First, that it is certain that arbiters, groups and individuals determined by circumstances or by a regulation, actually perform the legal functions set forth at the beginning. They enforce and demand respect for the order dictated by the customs and general ideas of their society. The first two /arbiters and groups/ do so by relying on the group and its dynamics; the individuals close /by means of/ their own specific functions recognized by the group and supported by it when they fulfill them.

Second, that the rules of organization and functioning of Sarakatsani groups, stated above, their customs as well as what we have called "their general social ideas" take the place of rules or prescriptions of law. For, depending on the cases and the circumstances, conformity to them is required. And they are followed as a result of the mechanism of "sanction-coercion," either visible or disguised.

Sarakatsani society therefore has law and agencies of law. Though they are not always apparent, they nonetheless exist.

673 674 CRIME AND MISDEMEANORS AMONG THE SARAKATSANI.

The Sarakatsani consider a certain number of acts as crimes or misdemeanors. We propose in this section to describe them, as well as (128) to indicate the punishments associated with them and the means of which they are carried out.

Homicide and assault.

682 Respect for life and for the integrity of the body is a rule the violation of which leads to the death of the culprit.

/217/ This rule must not be considered identical with that of the penal code. A look at the situations in which it is applied will suffice